



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,326	02/26/2002	Ikuo Uratani	NIT-332	3456

7590

10/19/2005

Mattingly, Stanger & Malur, P.C
1800 Diagonal Road, Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SHINGLES, KRISTIE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,326

Applicant(s)

URATANI ET AL.

Examiner

Kristie Shingles

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 July 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-6 have been canceled Claims 7-14 are new.

Claims 7-14 are pending.

Drawings

1. The proposed drawing corrections filed 7/18/2005 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Abstract

2. The proposed abstract corrections filed 7/18/2005 have been accepted by the Examiner.

Priority

3. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) received on 7/18/2005. The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. JP 2001-091635 filed on 3/28/2001.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Robbins et al* [US 2002/0029319] in view of *Ishibashi et al* (USPN 6,463,504).

a. **Per claim 7**, *Robbins et al* teach a storage system comprising:

- a computer (Figure 1, paragraphs 0013, 0015); and
- a storage device connected to said computer (paragraphs 0015-0017),
- wherein said storage device includes plural logical units which include one or more first logical units managed by said computer and one or more second logical units not managed by said computer (Figure 1, paragraphs 0006, 0017-0019);
- said computer has an application controlling coupling to said logical units (paragraphs 0006, 0014, 0016-0021) and
- said application enables said computer to couple to said one or more first logical units based on the information to specify each of said plural logical units, and said computer is not enabled to couple to said one or more second logical units (paragraphs 0018-0023, 0035, 0040).

Yet *Robbins et al* fail to explicitly teach said storage device responds with information to specify each of said plural logical units according to an inquiry from said computer. However, *Ishibashi et al* teach the storage device responding with information to the hosts specifying the assigned logical units (col.3 lines 50-54, col.4 lines 2-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

Art Unit: 2141

teachings of *Robbins et al* and *Ishibashi et al* for the purpose of communicating to the computers and hosts which logical units they have access to in order to inform them of their storage assignments for future accesses.

b. **Claims 12 and 14** contain limitations that are substantially equivalent to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 8**, *Robbins et al* and *Ishibashi et al* teach the storage system according to claim 7, *Robbins et al* further teach wherein said application does not inhibit said computer to couple to plural said first logical units based on the information to specify each of said plural logical units, and inhibits for said computer to couple to plural said second logical units (paragraphs 0018-0020, 0024, 0028-0030).

d. **Per claim 9**, *Robbins et al* and *Ishibashi et al* teach the storage system according to claim 7, *Robbins et al* further teach wherein said storage devices includes: a command device exclusively receiving operation commands to one of the logical units among said plural logical units, said commands being received from said computer (paragraphs 0024, 0028); a means executing a coupling operation of one of the first logical units according to the commands received by said command device, wherein said command device is one of said plural logical units (paragraphs 0024, 0028).

e. **Per claims 10 and 13**, *Robbins et al* and *Ishibashi et al* teach the storage system according to claim 7, *Robbins et al* further teach comprising plural computers connected to said storage device (Figure 1, paragraphs 0013-0017).

f. **Per claim 11**, *Robbins et al* and *Ishibashi et al* teach the storage system according to claim 7, *Ishibashi et al* further teach wherein said storage device comprises plural logical units which include the one or more first logical units and the one or more second logical units (Abstract, col.2 lines 7-27, col.3 lines 13-21) and a means responding with information for specifying said plural logical units indicating connection port numbers, target IDs, and LU number of each said plural logical units according to the inquiry from said computer (col.4 lines 18-50).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: *Kirby* (USPN 6,526,478), *Blumenau et al* (USPN 6,295,575).

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2141

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER